

**REMARKS**

Claims 44-47, 49, 51-53 and 63-71 are pending in the application. Claims 1-43, 48, 50 and 54-62 were previously canceled. Claims 65-71 were previously added.

Claims 44-47, 51 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,473,088 to Matsumoto et al, hereinafter "Matsumoto". Claim 44 is independent.

Independent claim 44 provides a method for automatic control of window overlap, including automatically determining priorities of each window of a plurality of overlapping windows displayed on a graphical user interface, and automatically arranging the plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of the priority on the graphical user interface. The window priority is derived from a topic of each window of the plurality of windows.

Matsumoto discloses a multiple image display system that includes a display device for simultaneously displaying image data that is inputted by a plurality of image data input means, external action input means for receiving an external action, and means for determining and allocating display priorities for the image data sets. The system also includes control means for controlling the display of the inputted image data sets in accordance with the display priorities and the result obtained by the comparison of the data transmission rate for the frame memory with the sum detected for the input data transmission rates (col. 2, lines 38-67).

In one embodiment, the display priorities are allocated in the order in which the connections are detected, and because this process is performed at the time of initialization, the priorities are arbitrarily determined by the system (col. 7, lines 55-60).

When an image is selected by moving or manipulating the display cursor, the priorities are so re-allocated that the selected window receives the first priority (col. 9,

lines 48-53). When one or more windows are moved by the manipulation of the display pointer, the display position of each input display window that is changed by the moving action is altered, and the priorities are so re-allocated that the priorities are lowered, beginning with the foremost window and continuing to the rearmost window (col. 10, lines 48-59). When the display position and the size of the display window are altered, the priorities are so re-allocated that the highest priority is allocated for the selected enlarged window and the priorities are sequentially lowered toward the rearmost window (col. 11, lines 42-53).

Matsumoto discloses a system and method for determining the priorities of multiple display windows based on factors such as input data transfer rates, order of connection detection, selection or movement of windows by an operator, and enlargement of windows by an operator. The Examiner contends that the priority of each window is derived from a window name. However, there is no teaching in Matsumoto that priorities are assigned based on a name of a window. Window names are provided merely to identify an input port, but have no bearing on a priority assigned to a display window. Therefore, Matsumoto does not teach or suggest assigning a priority to a window based on a topic, that is, for example, derived from one or more keywords. Thus, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest determining priorities of display windows, "wherein said window priority is derived from a topic of each window of said plurality of windows," as is recited in claim 44.

Therefore, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 44. Thus, claim 44 is not anticipated by Matsumoto.

Claims 45-47 and 51 depend from claim 44. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 44, claims 45-47 and 51 are not anticipated by Matsumoto.

Independent claim 71 provides a method for automatic control of window overlap, including automatically determining priorities of each window of a plurality of overlapping windows displayed on a graphical user interface, and automatically

arranging the plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of the priority on the graphical user interface. The window priority is derived from a topic of each window of the plurality of windows, and the topic of each window is determined by at least one keyword. The priority is determined by scanning the window for the at least one keyword, and determining a frequency of the at least one keyword in the window.

Matsumoto discloses a system and method for determining the priorities of multiple display windows based on factors such as input data transfer rates, order of connection detection, selection or movement of windows by an operator, and enlargement of windows by an operator. The Examiner equates a "keyword" with the name of the input disclosed in Matsumoto. However, as discussed above, Matsumoto does not teach assigning priorities to a window based on a name of a window. Furthermore, the names in Matsumoto are provided merely to identify and input, and have no bearing on priorities of the windows. Thus, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest determining a method for automatic control of window overlap, "wherein said window priority is derived from a topic of each window of said plurality of windows," and "wherein said topic of each window is determined by at least one keyword," as recited in claim 71.

Therefore, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 71. Thus, claim 71 is not anticipated by Matsumoto.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 44-47, 51 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Matsumoto is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 44-47, 51 and 71 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,559,533 to Bass et al., hereinafter "Bass". Claim 49 depends from independent claim 44. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As described above, Matsumoto does not disclose a method for automatic control of window overlap, wherein "said window priority is derived from a topic of each window of said plurality of windows," as recited in claim 44. Therefore, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 44.

Applicants do not believe that Bass makes up for the deficiencies of Matsumoto, as it applies to claim 44. Therefore, Matsumoto and Bass, whether considered independently or in combination with one another, fail to disclose all of the elements of claim 44. Thus, claim 44 is patentable over the cited combination of Matsumoto and Bass.

Claim 49 depends from claim 44. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 44, claim 49 is also patentable over the cited combination of Matsumoto and Bass.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claim 49 as unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Bass is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 49 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto. Claims 52 and 53 depend from independent claim 44. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As described above, Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 44, and thus claim 44 is patentable over Matsumoto. Claims 52 and 53 depend from claim 44. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 44, claims 52 and 53 are also patentable over Matsumoto.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 52 and 53 as unpatentable over Matsumoto is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 52 and 53 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 63-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,360 to Odam et al, hereinafter "Odam". Claim 63 is independent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 63 provides a method for automatic control of window overlap based on a user's history of window use, including automatically determining a priority of each window of a plurality of overlapping windows displayed on a graphical user interface, and automatically arranging the plurality of windows to overlap one another in order of the priority on the graphical user interface. The priority is derived from an amount of scrolling performed on a window.

As discussed above, Matsumoto discloses a system and method for determining the priorities of multiple display windows based on factors such as input data transfer rates, order of connection detection, selection or movement of windows by an operator, and enlargement of windows by an operator. However, Matsumoto does not disclose a method "wherein said priority is derived from an amount of scrolling performed on a window," as recited in claim 63.

Odam discloses a method for arranging windows in a workspace including assigning a priority to each of a plurality of windows in the workspace according to a predefined criteria (col. 3, lines 24-28). In one embodiment, each window is assigned a priority number, initially assigned according to some predetermined criteria, such as the relative time of each window's creation, a user's preference, and the relative importance of each window (col. 7, lines 4-12). In one example, the priority number of each window may be assigned based on a time that each window is created, or based on a preference set by a user (col. 13, lines 47-57).

Odam discloses a method including setting a priority of a window based on an assigned number, according to criteria including a time of each window's creation, a user's preference, or the relative importance of each window. However, Odam does not

disclose setting a priority of a window based on an amount of scrolling performed on a window. Therefore, Odam does not disclose a method "wherein said priority is derived from an amount of scrolling performed on a window," as recited in claim 63.

Neither Matsumoto nor Odam disclose or suggest a method "wherein said priority is derived from an amount of scrolling performed on a window," as recited in claim 63. Therefore, Matsumoto and Odam, whether considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 63. Thus, claim 63 is patentable over the cited combination of Matsumoto and Odam.

Claims 64-70 depend from claim 63. For at least reasoning similar to that provided in support of the patentability of claim 63, claims 64-70 are patentable over the cited combination of Matsumoto and Odam.

For the reasons set forth above, the rejection of claims 63-70 as unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Odam is overcome. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 63-70 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

An indication of the allowability of all pending claims by issuance of a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/30/05



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: (203) 327-4500  
Fax: (203) 327-6401

